DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 264 FL 016 316

AUTHOR Pollock, Richard
TITLE Towards a Pedagogic Theory of Interpreting: Learning to Interpret, or Interpreting to Learn?
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 18p.; In: Doble, G., Ed. and Griffiths, B. T., Ed. Oral Skills in the Modern Languages Degree. Proceedings of a Conference at the University of Bradford (Bradford, England, January 3-6, 1984); see FL 016 311.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiolingual Skills; Aural Learning; Classroom Techniques; College Second Language Programs; Educational Strategies; Higher Education; Interpretive Skills; Language Fluency; Learning Strategies; Listening Comprehension; Listening Skills; Oral Language; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Speech Skills; *Translation; *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

Interpreting, or oral translation, can be used in undergraduate second language study as a technique for developing oral skills. The technique can produce both sound linguistic judgment and confident oral and written performance that last beyond testing. It integrates four essential elements of oral/aural skills: comprehension, phonology/fluency, lexicon, and grammar. The improvement of comprehension and fluency produces skills, and the reinforcement of lexicon and grammar produces knowledge. The combination of skills and knowledge produces performance. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277264

TOWARDS A PEDAGOGIC THEORY OF INTERPRETING: LEARNING TO INTERPRET, OR INTERPRETING TO LEARN?

Richard Pollock

University of Bradford

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Newson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL016316

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TOWARDS A PEDAGOGIC THEORY OF INTERPRETING: LEARNING TO INTERPRET, OR INTERPRETING TO LEARN?

Richard Pollock

University of Bradford

I INTRODUCTION

'Vox et praeterea nihil'.[1] If Latin were still the language of epitaphs, instead of itself having been consigned to the grave, these words might constitute the perfect memorial to the accomplished interpreter - 'a voice and nothing more'. For such faint praise, far from damning its recipient, would testify to his attainment of that most desirable, most elusive quality in an interpreter - unobtrusiveness. To be good enough not to be noticed - that, for the interpreter, is achievement.[2] Indeed, the accomplished interpreter is one to whom otherwise English words with the prefix 'inter-' (connoting, as they do, a perceived third presence) cannot reasonably be applied. 'Vox et praeterea nihil': for the interpreter, an epitaph - indeed, an epitome - devoutly to be wished.

At this point there are four questions which the Devil's advocate, ever vying for the souls of the interred (not itself connoting a third presence, even unperceived!) might pose:

(i) Surely we are not concerned with dead interpreters? 'No,' we reply, 'but the antecedents go back a long way: interpreters did not spring fully grown from the head of Robbins, equipped for battle and uttering their war-cries, like Athena from the head of Zeus (one instance when Olympian axing proved creative).'

(ii) Surely we are not concerned with 'dead' languages? 'No,' we again reply, 'for better or worse we take your point - but not the dichotomy it implies.'

(iii) Why teach interpreting to anyone? 'That,' we begin, 'is not the negative question you deem it' - but, before we can say more, there comes a more Devil-ish aphorism.

(iv) 'A voice and nothing more'. Doesn't that sum up modern linguists as a species? They talk, but have nothing to say! 'Wrong again,' we might well riposte. 'The Greeks had a word for it - in the beginning was the Logos, meaning not only 'utterance', but 'reason'...'

Thus far the 'Plutonic' dialogue. But to each answer to our infernal questioner we might add - 'We shall have more to say - below'. And it would seem that the case for interpreting, as for oral and aural skills, is in today's circumstances intrinsically connected with the case for modern languages themselves. Our concern is with the 'educated linguist'.

II CONTINUUM AND COMMUNITY

Allusions to civilisations, cultures, even languages, that are not our specialism ought not to leave us modern linguists cold. Such narrowness is the besetting danger of academic life, unworthy of the 'totality' and 'singleness of purpose' which university - in etymology and conception - primarily denotes. Dichotomies serve analysis, not perspective.

Perspective is paramount, both for a right valuation of languages in educational policy,[5] and for instilling them effectively as 'langues vivantes'. Yet the constant, if ill-defined, classification 'modern' - with its implied antithesis - suggests an inherent limit to the perspective and purview of our discipline, a fallacy that has too long been allowed to subordinate it to others. The dichotomy in the diachronic spectrum of language is, like all dichotomies, artificial: it goes some way to account for the weak influence attributed to, and exerted by, languages in our educational traditions and practice. Within the context of the twentieth century, it is as if some malign arbiter had decreed for languages a policy of 'divide - and overrule'. Languages - be they 'modern' or 'unmodern' - constitute a continuum, and our perspective and perceptions are weakened if we ignore the fact. The antithesis implicit in the misleading, if not misplaced, epithet 'modern' is as specious as the argument that 'unmodern' languages foster better English. A sensitive command of English should be the priority, and ultimately the mark, of all educated linguists - be they students of languages 'old' or 'new' - and certainly of those claiming performative skills. Indeed, as between ancient and modern languages, there should be in this respect no demarcation or 'rivals' - and certainly no Sheridan to complain: 'Egad, I think the interpreter is the hardest to be understood ...'[4]
The preferable generic for all concerned with language is 'linguist', devoid of epithet - permitting, though not lightly admitting, limitation. Unified if by nothing else, then at least by our concern for English, we linguists note that 1984 is no year of disgrace for the much misrepresented Orwell. What he has to say about English[5] merits no less attention than his more familiar theme. Indeed, research has been profitably directed to his language concerns.[6] How ironical for us that Orwell is commonly adjudged 'difficult to interpret'! We sympathise with his aversion to 'duckspeak', or to pidgin command of any language. Adding to Orwell the vision of a master lexicographer,[7] a respectful parody well summarises that common cause - at this stage in our discussion:

> Let Education with extensive view
> Survey the scene from Oldspeak to the New ...

In this era of communications, awareness of language as a continuum can only help society realise its inability to communicate, and thus enhance linguists' potential contribution to man's future. Similarly, as those of us concerned with the performance of language focus our attention on 'language as communication' - i.e. as the means to community - we can the more effectively promote it by recognising that area of language, and language-

teaching, in which we specialise as part of the one language-continuum, diachronic and synchronic. The reasoning here is not eschatological. It is not merely the case that man must - for survival - communicate; it is in his nature to do so. He is, as Aristotle (when accurately rendered) observed, 'a community being.'[8]

III ORAL SKILLS IN DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE

We do well, in the circumstances of modern life, and in our promotion of language-skills in education, to recall the priority given in Greece (the mainspring of those cultures we mostly profess) to mastery of the spoken word. Five centuries before Aristotle, long before the use of writing, it was by word of mouth alone that Homer first sowed the seeds of the Greek ideals we unconsciously continue: his was indeed a 'blooming' lyre. No student ever merited a better reference than the palpably mortal, yet articulate, Achilles - whose mentor, according to Homer, saw his role as - 'to make thee a doer of deeds, and a master too of speech.'[9] Indeed, these priorities are in reverse order in the original Greek - rightly suggesting that had Achilles sought his ultimate defence in words, not weapons, the 'quick' heel might have been lost to the field of metaphor, if not to other fields. That ideal retains its relevance, and its priority, today.

Surely the ancient world gives the lie irrefutably to the view that intellectual depth and linguistic skills cannot be pursued simultaneously. The thinkers, dramatists, and moulders of democracy in Greece made their lasting contribution to civilisation through the spoken word - and their contemporaries' skill at listening. Education in both Greece and Rome was nothing if not the training to speak. It was quite as much for that reason, as for benefits to written style, that classical - rather than other - languages so long dominated our educational practice. For both Greeks and Romans the training of tongue, mind, and character were integrally related: the persuasive Demosthenes disciplined his diction with pebbles in his mouth - though that was not itself the reason that as late as the seventeenth century speakers trained on Greek felt greatness was just a stone's throw away.

We should note, too, that amid this 'oral' educational tradition Romans were brought up for seven centuries bilingually, by foreign native-speakers. We perhaps have something to learn from this valuation of the native teacher's potential. All the great Roman orators were trained by Greeks, and chairs of rhetoric - which meant primarily mastery of the spoken word - were endowed in every important city. Such was the primacy of language in education. Thus were ideas fostered and civilisation spread.

It was this same oral propagation of ideas and influence that bred the first interpreters - as the word's classical pedigree suggests. Small wonder it is Latin. For despite their subtlety and eloquence, the Greeks were conscious monoglots (hence, perhaps, their apotheosis in English education), unable to understand their own immigrant police (from south Russia!) and pedagogues: indeed, whether as cause or effect, the Greek language - for all its refinement - was remarkably inadequate to discuss problems of translation.

Perhaps for this reason the Greek historian Herodotus is lost in wonder at Egypt's interpreters, numerous and valued enough in that hierarchic, seven-tiered society to be in a class of their own - albeit sixth, hence just above the vulgar 'boatmen'.[10] The Romans, being better linguists, took interpreters for granted. It was the negotiating of an early 'treaty of Rome' that prompted Caesar, confronted even then with an intractable French leader, to 'remove the ordinary interpreters and speak through a friend in whom he had complete confidence'.[11] Early evidence, in turn, for the view that interpreting is essentially creative!

There is purpose in this retrospect. We see that oral skills are no new priority in education, and that the ideas and creativeness of two formative cultures were not inhibited by conscious pursuit of them, even in an emphatically bilingual context. Moreover, but for the artificial dichotomy between 'classical' and 'modern' cultures, we might not now - at the end of the second millenium AD - be still persuading both ourselves and others that foreign languages are to be spoken as well as studied; that education is the 'bringing out' of communicative potential; and that the linguist's bridge-building is as crucial as the engineer's. The Romans did both. Indeed, the Romans' maxim - 'rem tene, verba sequentur'[12] ('stick to your subject and the words will follow') - takes on added significance in view of their linguistic abilities, and should epitomise the aspiration of the educated linguist today, as in any age. No less evident is the point that language - particularly, oral communication - is a bastion of received culture, not (as its detractors might allege) a bastard of modernity, in the sphere of higher education.

IV INTERPRETING - THE ACT OF MEANING, AND THE MEANING OF THE ACT

Against this background, only cursorily sketched, of antecedents too often ignored or at least misunderstood, we can with greater perspective and, hence, purpose assess and argue the 'extensive view' that **interpreting within language-studies** shares with **language-studies within education.** Both bring a width of vision and a depth of insight, derived both from learning and experience, to bear upon their respective macrocosms.
To come to terms with interpreting, let us come to interpreting with terms better defined. Indeed, a major purpose of this paper is to define, to delimit what previously was ill-defined - hence unnecessarily elusive for both teachers and taught.

We spoke of Orwell as 'difficult to interpret'. It goes without saying that interpretation in that sense - i.e. **literary interpretation** - is not in the least the same as **linguistic (i.e. oral) interpretation.** Put simply, both require total understanding if they are to be effective, but linguistic interpretation entails complete re-creation of the original 'text', whereas literary interpretation is selective and much more subjective. The intellectual demands of oral interpretation - not least, in endeavouring to get into the mind of the speaker, indeed to identify with that other personality, and in sure judgment of allusions - are no less than those of literary interpretation.

But clearly these uses of the word 'interpretation' serve only to highlight the semantic, even the terminological, problems with which linguistic discussion is notoriously fraught. Suffice it to say - though unfortunately it does need saying - the linguistic interpreter, while indeed a performer and participant in a speech 'act', is not a dragoman.

Nor, furthermore, is interpreting to be identified with translating - a point, while again familiar, that bears reiteration. It has been as cogently argued by Professor Danica Seleskovitch[13] (of ESIT, Paris) as by anyone. Only the Slav nations have valid lexical defence for conflating the two activities, though ancillary adjectives and adverbs ensure they rarely do. The distinction must be clear in any language. **Interpreting** is the complete oral rendering of an oral text (a statement, speech or dialogue) into another language, whereas **translating** is the complete rendering (usually, written) of a written text into another language. It may be said that translators read between the lines, but interpreters between the words. But neither activity, strictly speaking, is concerned to summarise or edit.

In the professional context the challenge to the interpreter is threefold:

(i) Semantic - to convey the content of the utterance with total accuracy;
(ii) Stylistic - to retain the mood and nuance of the utterance;
(iii) Social - to have no adverse effect on the atmosphere of the occasion (a crucial consideration).

These are daunting, but exhilarating, challenges. Curiously, when one is interpreting, they inspire rather than depress: each new utterance is at first sensed as an opportunity to do well, and thereafter as an opportunity to do better. Once one 'has the bit between one's teeth' as an interpreter (if the image can be allowed!), one does not think - indeed, one has no time to think - of 'challenges', 'problems', and other manifestations of introspection. The adrenalin flows. One is, after all, in an 'inter-personal' situation. It is the most natural human response to speak when spoken to, and to wish not to keep the hearer waiting. One responds, indeed, to the personalities around one (both in consecutive and simultaneous modes) - or, at least, visible from the booth (in simultaneous mode) - and, in so doing, one is often surprised by one's own personality and the resources it evinces (resources which, in other contexts of life, may never emerge or even be called upon). Interpreting 'for real' is indeed an 'e-ducation', a 'bringing out'. Thus it is in two senses 're-creation' (both of the personality and of the text), and at best - at one's performative best - it is recreation.

But, for all these considerations of personality (and a fuller discussion will come in the paper by John Henderson, 'Language performance, context and the personality of the interpreter'), the interpreter is not - and should not be - a 'prima donna'. The interpreter's satisfaction -and it is intense - comes retrospectively, and from three unspectacular things:

(i) creating understanding;
(ii) having a clear conscience;
(iii) not attracting attention.

Renée Van Hoof succinctly and graphically summarises the qualities indispensable to the effective interpreter as follows:

> C'est, pour employer une expression allemande, un 'Einfühlungsvermögen' - autrement dit, la capacité et l'aptitude de se mettre dans la peau d'autrui. Dire ce que l'orateur dit, au besoin mieux qu'il ne le dit, mais pas autrement, sans ajouter son grain de sel. Pour cela, il faut avant tout pouvoir et savoir écouter les autres attentivement - une distraction (ne fût-ce que de quelques secondes) peut être fatale - les comprendre et rendre leur pensée fidèlement. De plus - mais cela va sans dire - l'interprète doit être discret.[14]

The most indispensable quality, of course, is a sensitive and resourceful command of language - not least, one's own. Marshak (who, inter alia, translated the whole of Robert Burns into Russian) aptly reminds the interpreter/translator:

> 'Tis good, in foreign tongues you're versed -
> But mastery of your own comes first.[15]

V INTERPRETING - THE PROFESSION AND ITS PROCESSES

We have tried to indicate the main features of professional interpreting as a skill, and of its practitioners. It remains to clarify its implementation. There are two modes by which professional interpreting is effected:

(i) Simultaneous interpreting (SI) - where the interpreter speaks while the person being interpreted speaks; and
(ii) Consecutive interpreting (CI) - where the interpreter speaks after the person being interpreted.

Both modes are subsumed under the generic title of the profession - 'conference interpreting' - and both can apply to either monologue or dialogue situations. Chronologically - obviously - CI antedates SI, the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 being conventionally cited as CI's official début,[16] though - as we have already noted - interpreters were numerically quite strong even in antiquity. SI was first patented as a technique by IBM in 1926, and its first implementation (in whispered form, without the booths now deemed indispensable) was at Geneva in a tentative form in 1927 and, on a larger scale, in the USSR in 1928 for the sixth congress of Comintern. It is noteworthy that the major impetus for SI's early development and use came from the USSR (elsewhere the general access to French and English enabled CI - essentially the mode for a two-language context - to meet conference

needs much longer). It is of particular interest to note that the first scientific conference serviced by SI was on physiology (Leningrad, 1935), opened by none other than Academician I.P. Pavlov, theorist of conditioned reflexes! But it took the aftermath of World War to establish SI, just like CI before it - namely, the Nuremberg Trials, at which all the prosecuting nations used their own languages; scarcely a typical conference, perhaps, but the foundation of SI's subsequent primacy at multi-lingual official meetings, in particular (since 1951) those of the United Nations.

Two features conduce to SI skills being a rarer attainment than those required for CI:

(a) SI necessitates specialised technical equipment, the hire of which is a major expense for conference organisers;
(b) the need to react and talk rapidly in one language while hearing another requires particular personal qualities in the interpreter.

I do not subscribe to the view that SI is more difficult - intellectually or linguistically - than CI. Both modes are demanding in their respective ways, but - given a really good command of the two relevant languages, and the appropriate personality - both are attainable with practice. One learns to interpret by interpreting, preferably having had a good course of instruction first. And how right it is that personality matters - since 'persona' is primarily, in Latin, the actor's mask, or 'what the sound comes through'.

As I have implied, CI is by no means the easier mode of interpreting. It needs all the qualities of SI, including swift mental and linguistic reflexes and a considerable accumulation of empirical and intellectual luggage[17] from which he always has something to declare. CI, however, requires three other attributes in particular:

(i) note-taking skill (a highly-personalised knack);
(ii) a good, productive memory;
(iii) a positive, yet unobtrusive, personality, acceptable to the participants in the bilingual (or, less often, plurilingual) situation being interpreted.

Whereas SI enables the interpreter to sit out of the limelight, in the semi-privacy of a sound-proof booth - seeing, and being seen, through a glass (often darkly) and assisted by a colleague's jottings and research, even knitting (as one has observed) like latter-day Mesdames Défarge - in CI the interpreter is generally alone, at the table with the discussants, and thus - in almost every sense - exposed. There can be no doubt that, in its most demanding forms, CI is far from easy. Until you see it done, you cannot realise (sic) what interpreting is all about. Would that television showed it taking place (as and when it does take place), instead of 'cutting' it: what stimulus the numb-dumb British televiewer would derive - and what enjoyment! - from being at last unprotected from foreign languages, and seeing what it means to interpret. Far from being a discouragement, there are few more potent incentives to linguistic aspiration than this too rare experience.

Finally, in our adumbration of interpreting's real-life processes, we need briefly to consider the circumstances in which each of the two modes is used. The umbrella term 'conference interpreting' has considerable currency - witness the name of the professional association to which many, though by no means all, of its leading exponents belong (AIIC - Association Internationale des Interprètes de Conférence). It applies, and is applicable, mainly to multi-lateral, or bi-lateral, international meetings of a representative, specialist, or governmental nature, the proceedings of which are conducted in a largely formal manner. It is virtually only in such contexts that SI is used (for reasons mentioned). The great merit of SI is the sheer 'through-put' of business. The speaker does not have to pause for interpretation, and the latter is effected - in parallel - into as many languages as there are booths and interpreters for, with a lag (behind the speaker's utterance) of only 3 to 4 seconds on average. Hence all regularly-convening multi-national organisations have permanent, purpose-built accommodation for SI: the obvious examples - the UN and its constituent organisations, the European Community, the European Parliament, World Commodity Organisation, and Comecon - by no means exhaust the modern list. These bodies rarely use CI - though top professional interpreters are capable of both SI and CI, and there are few major opportunities in interpreting for anyone who is not.

On the other hand, CI - though difficult to perform well - finds more practitioners, simply because in this context supply is a function of demand. CI covers a very wide range of two-language situations, from 'Summit' conferences downwards. For formal meetings at almost any level CI would come into the category of 'conference interpreting' (see above) - as too would semi-formal or informal interpreting of speakers appearing in their official capacity (eg VIPs' speeches, post-prandial or of a similar nature; press-interviews; communiqués, etc). However, a less formal, less systematised label - 'ad hoc' or 'liaison' interpreting - is applied to the CI used in less formal situations, often with a less clearly defined rôle for the interpreter (perhaps only partial interpretation is required): for example, tours with foreign visitors or assistance to non-native speakers involved in the processes of law. Often the utterances, and even the situations themselves, are very brief. Thus, this latter type of CI - 'ad hoc' or 'liaison' interpreting - although less recognised and well-defined than its often quite significant contexts deserve, is set apart by its less formal nature from 'conference interpreting', in the eyes of the professional conference interpreters at least. It must be admitted, however, that the distinction is often a very fine one.

VI FROM PROFESSION TO PEDAGOGY

We have made a number of distinctions in our approach to what is here of focal interest - the teaching of interpreting to undergraduates. We have advisedly considered some, at least, of the philosophical and practical antecedents to what we may call 'pedagogic interpreting'. An appreciation of the profession of interpreting, such as we have given, is essential to a proper evaluation of 'interpreting in the undergraduate course'. As Plato makes clear, pedagogy is the 'leading on', the 'assisting', of the young mind to clearly

perceived goals in knowledge and skill. The mind must know what to imitate. So must the pedagogy.

For too long we have failed to make explicit in this context the most crucial distinction of all - as between **pedagogic interpreting (PINT)** and **subsequent aspiration to professional interpreting (SPRINT)**: the acronyms have perhaps a useful mnemonic logic. As I have discussed elsewhere,[18] we are not concerned with interpreters as an end-product of an undergraduate course: they might - after practical experience or a post-graduate course - prove a by-product, as has been borne out by the Bradford Postgraduate Diploma in Interpreting and Translating. Similarly, the Mus.B. does not produce a concert pianist.[19]

What makes the distinction valid, and even possible, is the empirical evidence of undergraduate teaching. Ironically, the sheer unfeasibility of the lofty vocational goals initially pursued in some technological universities has brought to light, if not to birth, pedagogical values in interpreting unsuspected in any methodological thinking that preceded its introduction to undergraduate language studies. But then it is in the nature of experiment that its fruits are often unexpected. Yet the identifying of interpreting's demands and benefits in language-learning poses its own challenge - to the methods of our teaching and to the planning of our courses. If our concern for oral and aural skills is genuine, it is a challenge we cannot ignore. Too much in modern languages degree courses is presented as if in watertight compartments: interpreting - because it draws on, and thus strengthens, the other course-constituents found worthwhile - affords, in a double sense, a means of communication. But our methods and our planning need to bring that out - not in the interests of interpreting per se, but to improve (as is very possible) the cohesion and thus the effectiveness of a modern languages degree course. And in the crucial matter of language competence alone, it is surely the case that at undergraduate level all skills are interdependent. Anything that promotes cohesion conduces to coherence.

VII PEDAGOGIC INTERPRETING - PREMISES AND PRINCIPLES

Most real-life interpreting situations can be simulated, as many of us know from experience. By the same token, the very process of interpreting - be it consecutive or simultaneous - can be performed, ie emulated. The Greeks, in their education that set such store on speaking and listening skills, had a word for it - 'mimesis', the 'imitation' of idealised models; moreover, they explained that imitation in terms of 'participation' is the exemplar envisaged. In teaching interpreting it is the imitation of reality that both stimulates and motivates the student. Given appropriate material, there is nothing more satisfying than to feel one is doing something realistic with language (one might add, perhaps -'at last'), and that one is learning - even coping - in a new, all-involving language context. This kind of speech 'act' can take on a degree of meaning for the student that will bring out for him - as for the more experienced interpreter mentioned earlier - unsuspected personal resources of linguistic knowledge, intellectual agility, and - thus - of

determination. Much, of course, depends on the tutor - not on the tutor's experience of interpreting, but on gradation of target-material and on conscientious monitoring and guidance of students during the interpreting process. As my colleague Brian Griffiths will make clear, the teaching of interpreting needs the language laboratory, but it also needs more active participation by the tutor - hence more exercise of vigilance and judgment - than do other uses of the language laboratory as a learning aid: put simply, there is no single 'right answer' to the task being tackled by the students. So far from presenting problems to methodology, this situation is rich in potential - for academic benefit, skill-acquisition, and (if duly prepared and sensitively conducted) enjoyment.

The key principle for pedagogic interpreting (PINT) is that it should be used on oral material - i.e. on material intended for oral delivery. It is tempting to think one can simply read to the students any journalistic report, with suitable voice inflexion, and ask for it to be interpreted - but the density of material, the structures of written style, and the absence of markers normally included by speakers as an aid to intelligibility, make such material difficult, unrealistic, and hence demoralising for the student. Perhaps a fair criterion of acceptability is whether as tutor one would have been able oneself, at the same stage as the students concerned, to cope with the interpreting text under consideration. We are, of course, talking of consecutive interpretation (CI) - since SI, though not necessarily more difficult - presupposes a control of the language, and of oneself, rarely present until an undergraduate is in the final year of the course.

The methodology of PINT, as we have dubbed undergraduate interpreting, and the ways of optimising its transfer-value need more time than this Conference allows. Knowing that the next paper will focus on pedagogical matters, I confine myself to observing that in my experience the student is initially best immersed in scripted utterances for interpreting practice - preferably the text of an actual interview. If the 'interview' is lifted from the press (a useful source of such material), care has to be taken to ensure that it has not been edited so much as to be unsuitable for oral presentation in an interpreting class. The normal procedure is that the tutor - or, if possible, two tutors - will perform the rôles of the interlocutors. The script should not be available to the student during the class, but can be usefully made available for individual consolidation work (plus or minus a recording) between classes - or, at that slightly later stage where one classroom-hour per text is sufficient, after the class. At more advanced levels of competence, in addition to the use of appropriately advanced (oral) texts, the most taxing - hence most rewarding - situation for the student is to be responsible for unscripted communication between two live (i.e. visibly present) interlocutors: this is the optimum 'imitation of reality'.

VIII THE QUART FROM THE 'PINT' BOTTLE

It is immediacy that makes interpreting - i.e. pedagogic interpreting - such a rewarding experience for both tutor and student: immediacy of challenge, of

reflex, of interpretation, of monitoring, of correction, and - not least, from the point of view of realism - of the interlocutor's response. All-involvement, in every sense, should be unavoidable - not only of the student group, but of the individual student's faculties and skills. It may with some justice be said that PINT 'reaches those parts that other (imbibings) fail to reach'. There is a third sense to 'all-involvement' - alluded to earlier in this section - which makes interpreting as a teaching-learning method potentially the most relevant of all ingredients in a degree course intended to produce educated linguists. It is that interpreting utilises, and optimises, virtually all other course elements. Thus -

(i) First and foremost, it is the enlivener of material (not just linguistic) taught under other headings.

(ii) It has great adaptability. With planning, it can complement and consolidate even the more theoretical aspects of language-study, for example, phonetics, stylistics, semantics, etc.

(iii) It is particularly the proving, and hence the improving, ground for the student's lexical and stylistic resources - transferring benefit thereby to both oral and written language-production in other areas of the degree curriculum.

(iv) It is unique as a medium for experiencing and applying in context, and thus for effectively assimilating, modern colloquial usage - an integral part of 'language as communication'.

(v) Interpreting provides that otherwise difficult link between the language laboratory (in its various applications) and the conversation class. It is highly doubtful whether the conversation class alone - even with the most experienced native teacher - can promote the same conversation capability as the combination 'interpreting + conversation class'.

(vi) In the interpreting situation misunderstandings, whether momentary or long-existing, are resolved immediately - the more so when, as should generally be the case, an oral 'fair copy' is provided by the tutor after each item interpreted.

(vii) Similarly, mistakes in language-production - be they grammatical errors or mistranslations - are allowed little or no chance to perpetuate themselves in the student's thinking (as can happen with non-oral, or semi-oral, work[20]), because of tutor-monitoring or (preferably - as unscripted scenarios allow) the puzzlement of the recipient-interlocutor.

(viii) Alone of all elements in a course focused on FL-acquisition, interpreting draws students' attention to their command, and delivery, of their native tongue - recalling the epigrammatic advice of Cato and Marshak, of the first and third Romes respectively, cited earlier. It may fairly be said that the student is learning to interpret and interpreting to learn.

Not the least among the all-involved in the potential of interpreting are course-designers and their consciences - which excludes no one. We have recognised that it should be as much of a challenge to our methodological thinking as it is to our students' linguistic and intellectual resources. But it also challenges our planning. If we who plan a university course, with its

broad educational purpose, fail to integrate interpreting with other course-elements, we not only devalue its academic potential, but overlook a rich source of the cohesion a university course can sometimes lack. Within a scheme of language studies, conjoined to studies of literature and society, interpreting can serve - like the interpreter himself - as an unobtrusive, but vital, link.

IX PEDAGOGIC INTERPRETING - THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

We have suggested the place of interpreting within the continuum of language practice, diachronic and synchronic, pedagogic and professional. It remains to consider its relationship with relevant aspects of linguistic theory.

Just as practice generates skill (our prime concern at this Conference), it is practice - in a different sense - that generates theory. We advisedly here treat theory after practice, as regards pedagogic interpreting. Theory, after all, as Greek tells us, means 'observation', and Sherlock Holmes pertinently remarks that 'it is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data'.[21]

There is, of course, theory 'a priori' and theory 'a posteriori'. We delineate pedagogic interpreting (PINT) from subsequent professional interpreting (SPRINT) on the basis of both. The 'a posteriori', struck by enlightening experience, led us to distinguish two species of teachable interpreting (PINT and SPRINT) because of their very different observable data - linguistic, psychological, and procedural. The 'a priori' element in the theory of PINT stems primarily from comparison with other theories of language - those of language-acquisition, translation, and (professional) interpreting (SPRINT). It is fashionable, though facile, to believe that there is no theory of SPRINT, whereas the theory of translation has attained an advanced stage of sophistication, not to say sophistry. This misjudgment is a measure of the extent to which hitherto academics have been in touch with the practice of translation, but not with the practice of interpreting. The fact is, however, that a number of researchers have contributed, and continue to contribute, to a theory of interpreting (SPRINT) as distinct and as refined as that of translation. Perhaps significantly, whereas the theory of translation owes most to academics who may have acquired practical experience, that of interpreting (SPRINT) owes most to professional practitioners turned academics. French, Russian and German contributors figure most prominently - notable among the more recent being Seleskovitch (Paris), mentioned earlier, and G.V. Chernov of the Moscow Institute of Foreign Languages, both professionals in their own right. Seleskovitch makes the point that while both translation and interpretation are concerned with sense rather than linguistic meaning, interpreters (of the SPRINT variety) aim for sense irrespective of linguistic meaning, while translators 'endeavour to equate the expression of sense, to a certain extent, with the linguistic meanings of the source language'[22] - a definition not wholly acceptable, perhaps, but a pungent distinction.

While Seleskovitch's observations on interpreters and translators may apply at professional level, and hence in the teaching of SPRINT, in pedagogic

interpreting (PINT) - on the other hand - the language itself is as much of a 'target' as the sense. Similarly, therefore, while the theory of PINT has points of resemblance to the theory of SPRINT - indeed, imitation (as we have made clear) is its essence - the teaching of each species of interpreting must differ in its assumptions and points of reference.

Although we should not be over-concerned to prove convergence between linguistics and performative language teaching (what Denis Girard less ambiguously calls 'language didactics'[23]), there is much in current linguistic trends that corroborates PINT and its evolving theoretical base. The emergence of psycholinguistics to succeed behaviourism affords many points of contact with pedagogic interpreting. Certainly the concern for student motivation and 'creativity', reflected in the influential work of Dell Hymes, Jakobovits, Wilga Rivers and others, is a major element in the aims and principles of PINT. Ironically, however, PINT bids fair to lend new significance to the language-laboratory, whose 'habit-forming' rôle the psycholinguists have discredited. In parallel to this trend in 'language didactics', we observe in linguistics itself a new vigour and (dare one say?) a greater realism - as evidenced, for example, by the Cambridge 'Tuesday Club'. They castigate overhasty Chomskyesque trends to deductively formulated theories of language. The study of language, it is felt, should be related to language-users and their individual circumstances or 'states' - what is weightily labelled the 'epiphenomenalist' view.[24] Thus we witness - in both 'didactics' (alias 'applied linguistics') and in theoretical linguistics - a bid for greater cognisance being taken of reality and context. Against this background pedagogic interpreting (PINT) - in both its theory and its practice - is evolving in a congenial climate. As we observe the trends in theory we are again reminded of the cyclic nature of learning, and we recall as still apposite the words of Sweet, founder of English linguistics, in 1899 - 'It is important to realise that the practical study of languages is not in any way less scientific than the theoretical'.[25]

Programmed learning for the acquisition of oral and aural skills has been clearly proved inadequate, both by the psycholinguists and by pedagogic experience. It has a rôle, to be sure, but how best is it to be mediated into natural language use, into daily oral and aural skills? There is also a different, but no less pressing, question confronting us. At a time when technology's rapid growth, and hence that of communications, is axiomatic, is the medium of communication - performative language skill - itself being optimised and propagated with comparable rapidity? In reply, we would suggest that PINT, properly purveyed, offers the infusion - and indeed, the fusion - required for both these communicative purposes. The key to advance in applied language, as distinct from applied technology, is not novelty, perhaps not even money (thus enhancing its feasibility) - but rather the 'mix' of methodological inputs and the motivation of participants: these are enhanced by realism and relevance - and interpreting provides both.

We are still, sixty years on, groping for what Palmer[26] posited as 'the complete method' in language. Again, the continuum - here, in methodological theory - is evident. The more we recognise the value of

realism and relevance, of creativity and motivation, the more Palmer's 'multiple line of approach' continues to press its validity. 'The complete method,' Palmer states, 'is not a compromise between two or more antagonistic schools; it boldly incorporates what is valuable in any system or method of teaching and refuses to recognise any conflict, except the conflict between the good and the inherently bad. The complete method will embody every type of teaching except bad teaching, and every process of learning except defective learning.' It might be Plato on the nature of 'mimesis'! But what is clear is that pedagogic interpreting, as we have discussed it, has a contribution to make to 'the complete method'.

CONCLUSION

Our treatment of the theory of pedagogic interpreting thus ends where our treatment of its practice began - with the emphasis on realism. In the evolving theory of PINT the imitation of reality is the key consideration. It is on this basis that we may define PINT - ie interpreting on the undergraduate course - as the contextualised combination of hitherto disparate, hence underdeveloped, performative language skills. Its strategic aims are twofold - i) sound judgment, and ii) confident performance, in oral (and written) communication - of a durability not merely sufficient to pass degree examinations. Its tactical objectives focus on four elements integral to oral and aural skills -i) comprehension, ii) phonology/fluency, iii) lexicon, and iv) grammar - to reinforce and improve them by contextualised application. The improvement of i) and ii) - comprehension and phonology/fluency - promotes skills; the reinforcement of iii) and iv) - lexicon and grammar - promotes knowledge. The sum of skills and knowledge is performance - not yet the peaks of professionalism, but the foothills at least.

In being thus 'led on' - as the word 'pedagogy' implies - to performance, the student acquires - as a natural concomitant - qualities of intellect and personality. This process, in turn, lends added meaning to the term 'pedagogic interpreting', and added educational worth to the course in which it figures. And, as we have made clear, it is the educated linguist, not the interpreter, for whom we are concerned in an undergraduate course - and for whom the need and opportunities exist.

By the end of the course, we are unlikely to say - even to the most talented linguists - 'rem tene, verba sequentur'. But we should be able to say to most students, after the manner of Lewis Carroll and Professor Seleskovitch, 'Take care of the sense, and the sounds will take care of themselves'. A student worthy of those words should have the 'ring of oral confidence' in English, as well as in the foreign language. Most of us who teach language have an ideal of excellence to which, though we may fall short ourselves, we should like our students to approximate. To that end, pedagogic interpreting can be a means.

Notes

1. This fairly familiar quotation is an example of Latin's quite frequent rôle as interpreter of Greek. The latter here (Plutarch, Apophth. Lac. 233A) refers to 'the nightingale or any short-lived creature' - 'phona tu tis essi kai ouden allo', i.e. 'a voice and nothing more'.

2. Cf. SCHMIDT P: Statist auf diplomatischer Bühne, Athenäum Verlag, Bonn, 1968, pp 44-48; an accomplished interpreter on the importance of unobtrusiveness. Schmidt was chief interpreter in the German Foreign Office until 1945, and the reluctant mouthpiece for much of Hitler's 'diplomacy'.

3. This observation is prompted by the publication in the spring of 1983 of the DES consultative paper Foreign Languages in the School Curriculum, commented upon by Mr R H Bird, Deputy Secretary at the DES, at the opening of the present Conference.

4. SHERIDAN, Richard Brinsley (1751-1816): The Critic, Act I, Scene 1.

5. George Orwell's linguistic comments are not confined to Nineteen Eighty-Four. His concern and insight are vividly expressed in his essays - notably The English Language and Politics and the English Language in ORWELL S and ANGUS I (eds): The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, Vol 3, (pp 40-46) and Vol 4 (pp 156-170), Secker and Warburg, London, 1968.

6. Cf. HODGE R and FOWLER R: Orwellian Linguistics in FOWLER R et al: Language and Control, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1979, pp 6-25.

7. JOHNSON Samuel (1709-1784): Vanity of Human Wishes.

8. Aristotle (Politics 1255^a) has the phrase 'anthropos phusei politikon zoon'. To Greeks the 'polis' was primarily the community to which they belonged. Hence LIDDELL H G and SCOTT R: Greek-English Lexicon, Vol II, OUP, 1951, render 'politikon' in this context as 'living in a community'. The version 'a political animal' is a subsequent distortion, and is neither the sense nor the intention of Aristotle's remark.

9. HOMER, Iliad IX, lines 442-443, as translated in LUCAS F L: Style, Cassell & Co. Ltd, London, 1955, p 23.

10. HERODOTUS, History II, 154, as discussed in HOW W W and WELLS J A Commentary on Herodotus, Vol. II, OUP, 1959, p 244.

11. CAESAR, De Bello Gallico I, 19.

12. Advice to aspiring orators at Rome, attributed to M Porcius Cato ('the Censor', 234-149 BC), founder of both rhetoric and prose in Latin.

13. Cf. SELESKOVITCH D: Why Interpreting is not Tantamount to Translating Languages, The Incorporated Linguist, Vol XVI, No. 2, Spring 1977, pp 27-33.

14. VAN HOOF R: Le Métier d'Interprète, The Incorporated Linguist, Vol XVI, No. 2, Spring 1977, p 40.

15. MARSHAK S: Epigram to an Interpreter/Translator in Liricheskiye epigrammy 'Sovetskiy Pisatel', Moscow, 1965.

16. CHERNOV G V: Teoriya i praktika sinkhronnogo perevoda 'Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya', Moscow, 1978, p 4.

17. Cf. SOUBBOTNIK S: Interpreting in the United Nations and its specialised agencies, The Incorporated Linguist, Vol IV, No. 2, April 1965, p 40.

18. POLLOCK R W W P: The Place of Interpreting in a University Modern Languages Course, Modern Languages, Vol LII, No. 1, 1971, pp 34-36.

19. BIRSE A H: Memoirs of an Interpreter, Michael Joseph, London, 1967, p 110. The author, who was personal interpreter to Churchill during World War II, develops a brief, but interesting, analogy between linguistic and musical interpretation.

20. Cf. BELYAEV B V: The Psychology of Teaching Foreign Languages, (trans. R F Hingley), Pergamon Press, 1963, p 220.

21. CONAN DOYLE A: Scandal in Bohemia.

22. SELESKOVITCH D: loc. cit., p 31.

23. GIRARD D: The Beginning of a New Era in Foreign Language Teaching?, The Incorporated Linguist, Vol XIV, No. 2, April 1975, p 38.

24. MOORE T and CARLING C: Understanding Language: Towards a Post-Chomskyan Linguistics, (Macmillan, London, 1982), p 151.

25. SWEET H: The Practical Study of Languages, 1899; reprint Oxford University Press, 1964.

26. PALMER H E: The Principles of Language-Study, 1922; reprint Oxford University Press, 1964.